



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/659,291

09/11/2003

Robert Markes

1339BGN-US

5615

7590 03/30/2009
Dekel Patent Ltd.
Beit HaRofim
Room 27
18 Menuha VeNahala Street
Rehovot,
ISRAEL

EXAMINER

ALEXANDER, LYLE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1797

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/30/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/659,291	Applicant(s) MARKES, ROBERT	
	Examiner Lyle A. Alexander	Art Unit 1797	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-10 and 12-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-10 and 12-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

In the 3/20/009 advisory action, the Office stated a new final rejection would be mailed out. However upon further consideration of Applicant's remarks, the Office agrees this replacement Office action should be non-final.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-20, drawn to an apparatus having a photodiode, classified in class 422, subclass 62.
- II. Claim 21, drawn to a method of optical analysis, classified in class 436, subclass 164.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions II and I are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the method can be performed with a different light source (e.g. not a photodiode) such as a fluorescent light source.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;

- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) **and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.**

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Newly submitted claim 21 is directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: See the above restriction requirement.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claim 21 is withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1, 5-10 and 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shain et al. (USP 6,027,349), Douglas et al. (USP 5,951,492), Moerman et al. (USP 6,706,159) or Stiene et al. (2004/0096959) in view of Eason et al (USP 5,186,897) alone or further in view of Tenerz et al. (USP 4,941,473).

See the appropriate paragraph of the 3/4/08 Office action.

Shain et al. (USP 6,027,349), Douglas et al. (USP 5,951,492), Moerman et al. (USP 6,706,159) and Stiene et al. (2004/0096959) all teach optical/colorimetric reactions that include a light source to facilitate analysis. These references are silent to the use of the claimed "coherent light" or "non-coherent light."

The court decided In re Boesch (205 USPQ 215) that optimization of a result effective variable is ordinarily within the skill of the art. A result effective variable is one that has well known and predictable results. The selection of the type of light best suited to resolve the particular analyte/reagent combination is a result effective variable. The selection of either coherent or non-coherent light is a result effective variable having the well known and expected results of providing the optimal conditions to best resolve the particular analyte/reagent combination.

It would have been within the skill of the art to modify Shain et al. (USP 6,027,349), Douglas et al. (USP 5,951,492), Moerman et al. (USP 6,706,159) or Stiene et al. (2004/0096959) and use either coherent or non-coherent light as optimization of a result effective variable and to gain the above advantages.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shain et al. (USP 6,027,349), Douglas et al. (USP 5,951,492), Moerman et al. (USP 6,706,159) or Stiene et al. (2004/0096959) in view of Eason et al (USP 5,186,897) alone or further in view of Tenerz et al. (USP 4,941,473) as applied to claims 1, 5-10 and 12-19 above, and further in view of Stanton et al (US 2004/0219523).

Shain et al. (USP 6,027,349), Douglas et al. (USP 5,951,492), Moerman et al. (USP 6,706,159) or Stiene et al. (2004/0096959) in view of Eason et al (USP 5,186,897) alone or further in view of Tenerz et al. (USP 4,941,473) are silent to the use of a "surface Plasmon resonance sensor."

Stanton et al. teach in paragraph [0255] a "surface Plasmon resonance sensor" (referenced hereafter as "SPR") in combination with a waveguide to gain the advantages of real time analysis of biological sample. Paragraph[0767] teach the SPR provides very sensitive analysis of binding/unbinding of analytes.

It would have been within the skill of the art to use a known technique to improve a similar device in the same way. Stanton et al. teaches SPR is known and used in combination with a waveguide for analysis of analytes in biological fluids. Stanton et al. also teach the SPR is advantageous because it provides sensitive, real time analysis of the analytes.

It would have been within the skill of the art to further modify Shain et al. (USP 6,027,349), Douglas et al. (USP 5,951,492), Moerman et al. (USP 6,706,159) or Stiene et al. (2004/0096959) in view of Eason et al (USP 5,186,897) alone or further in view of Tenerz et al. (USP 4,941,473) as applied to claims 1 and 5-19 above, and further in view of Stanton et al (US 2004/0219523) and use a SPR sensor to gain the above advantages.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3/12/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's remarks were convincing and the Office has replaced the 2/11/09 final action with a new non-final office action.

Applicant's traverse the application of Easton et al. stating this reference fails to teach the claimed connection to the optical waveguide. This is not convincing because Easton et al. is only used to teach the advantages of using an optical waveguide. The Office maintains Shain et al. (USP 6,027,349), Douglas et al. (USP 5,951,492), Moerman et al. (USP 6,706,159) and Stiene et al. all teach the claimed attachment to the processor.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lyle A. Alexander whose telephone number is 571-272-1254. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on 571-272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1797

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lyle A Alexander/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797

Lyle A Alexander
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1797